



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/777,886	02/07/2001		Masato Yoshida	O3020.0218/P0218	4209
24998	7590	07/06/2005	•	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEI 2101 L Stree		IRO MORIN & OS	NELSON, FREDA ANN		
Washington, DC 20037				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,		•		3639	

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/777,886	YOSHIDA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Freda A. Nelson	3639				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above, is less than thirty (30) days, a rr - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ute. cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed  s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status ·						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28	January 2005.					
,	nis action is non-final.	·				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)  Claim(s) 7 and 14-29 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withden 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 7 and 14-29 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) 7 and 14-29 is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a life.	ents have been received. ents have been received in Applicat riority documents have been receive eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ul>		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3639

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This is in response to a communication filed January 28, 2005 wherein:

The applicant has amended claim 7;

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 were canceled;

Claims 14-29 were added, but are not-entered; and

Claims 7 and 14-29 are pending.

#### Response to Amendment and Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 7 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- 1. Claims 7 and 14-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
- 2. In claim 7, line 10, the applicant uses the claim language "second transaction orderer/supplier price table" and the examiner is unable to determine

Art Unit: 3639

if the orderer/supplier price table or the orderer/mediator price table is being used.

- 4. In claim 7, lines 13-20, the applicant uses the claim language "joining the orderer and supplier together by a mediator, for supplying a specified product only when the price per quantity of the product of said first transaction mediator/supplier price table is equal to or less than the price per unit quantity of the product of said second transaction orderer/supplier price table" wherein the examiner takes the position that the price per quantity of the product of the first transaction mediator/supplier price table is not equal to or less than the price unit quantity of the product of the second transaction orderer/supplier price table thus eliminating the joining of the order and supplier together by a mediator.
- 5. In claim 14, line 15, the applicant uses the claim language "wherein said transaction is not initiated unless the price per quantity of the product of said first transaction mediator/supplier price table is equal to or less than the price per unit quantity of the product of said second transaction orderer/mediator price table" wherein the examiner takes the position that the price per quantity of the product of the first transaction mediator/supplier price table is not equal to or less than the price unit quantity of the product of the second transaction orderer/supplier price table thus eliminating the joining of the order and supplier together by a mediator because the transaction is not initiated.
- 6. In claim 25, the examiner is unable to determine if the orderer is an orderer or if the orderer is a mediator; the examiner is further unable to determine if the reception apparatus is located with the orderer or the mediator; and the

Art Unit: 3639

examiner is still further unable to determine who is the user or the orderer applicant

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. Claims 7 and 14-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; an,
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must-be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

In the present case, claim 7 only recites an abstract idea. The recited steps of joining the mediator and the supplier together... of said second transaction orderer/supplier price table does not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts (i.e. interaction in the steps with the computer/computer network or other equivalent means) since all of the recited steps can be performed in the mind of the user or by use of a pencil and paper. These steps only constitute an abstract idea.

Art Unit: 3639

Without a claimed basis, the claim may be interpreted in an alternative as involving no more than a manipulation of an abstract idea and therefore non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. In contrast, a method claim that includes in the preamble "A computer implemented method for ---", or something similar and includes in the body of the claim at least one structural / functional interrelationship which can only be computer implemented is considered to have a technological basis [See Ex parte Bowman, 61 USPQ2d 1669, 1671 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 2001).

Although the recited process produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, since the claimed invention, as a whole, is not within the technological arts as explained above, claims 7 and 14-29 are deemed to be directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

Art Unit: 3639

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Freda A. Nelson whose telephone number is (571) 272-7076. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FAN 06/24/05

JULL SPE 3629